

REMARKS

Applicants reply to the Office Action dated July 30, 2007, within the shortened three month statutory period for reply. Claims 1-6, 8, 10, and 17-22 were pending in the application and the Examiner rejects claims 1-6, 8, 10, and 17-22. Applicants add new claims 29-33. Support for the amendments and new claims may be found in the originally-filed specification, claims, and figures. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments and new claims. Applicants assert that the application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the pending claims is requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the Interview with Applicants' counsel on August 28, 2007 and for agreeing to review Applicants' proposed amendments. Applicants further thank the Examiner for agreeing in a telephone call with Applicants' Patent Agent on October 8, 2007, that the proposed amendments overcome the cited references.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 1-6, 8, 10, 17, 18, and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buchanan, U.S. Patent No. 6,009,408 in view of Hudson et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0040987 (“Hudson”) and Chung et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,644,721 (“Chung”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Hudson generally discloses a client-server based travel reporting system and Chung discloses a system for consolidating travel reservation information using a variety of currencies. The Examiner agreed, and Applicants assert, that the foregoing amended claims 1, 3, and 17 overcome the cited references, so these rejections are now moot.

Dependent claims 2, 4-6, 8, 10, 18, 20, and 22 variously depend from independent claims 1, 3, and 17, therefore dependent claims 2, 4-6, 8, 10, 18, 20, and 22 are differentiated from the cited reference for at least the same reasons as set forth above, as well as in view of their own respective features.

The Examiner rejects claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hudson in view of Chung and in further view of Felix et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0115141 (“Felix”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Dependent claim 19 variously depends from independent claim 17. As noted above, Hudson and Chung do not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 17 and Felix does not teach or suggest the missing features. Felix is limited to an electronic billing system which is capable of networking a larger number of billing parties with customers, which does not require a particular

billing party to contract with numerous billing service providers. Thus, claim 17 is differentiated from the cited references for at least the same reasons as set forth above, as well as in view of its own respective features.

New claims 29-33 depend from independent claims 1 and 3, so claims 29-33 are differentiated from the cited references for the same reasons as set forth above, in addition to their own respective features.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2814 **for which purpose a duplicate copy of this sheet is attached. This statement does NOT authorize charge of the issue fee.** Applicants invite the Examiner to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner has any questions regarding this Reply or the present application in general.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Howard I. Sobelman
Reg. No. 39,038

Dated: October 8, 2007

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
400 E. Van Buren
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Phone: 602-382-6228
Fax: 602-382-6070
Email: hsobelman@swlaw.com